

**Den Hollander Decl.
Exhibit E**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X
Roy Den Hollander,

Plaintiff on behalf of himself
and all others similarly situated,

Civil Action No. 07 CV 5873 (MGC)

-against-

Copacabana Nightclub,
China Club,
Guest House,
A.E.R. Nightclub,
Lotus,
Sol, and
Jane Doe Promoters,

Defendants .

-----X

**DECLARATION OF DEBORAH SWINDELLS DONOVAN
IN OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS MOTION TO
DISQUALIFY JUDGE CEDARBAUM**

Deborah Swindells Donovan, an attorney duly admitted to practice in the State of New York, hereby affirms the following under the penalty of perjury:

1. I am a partner with the law firm of Gordon & Rees, L.L.P., counsel for Defendant Lotus, one of the nightclubs named in the within action. As counsel for Lotus, I am fully familiar with the facts set forth herein. This Declaration is submitted in opposition to the frivolous Motion To Disqualify Judge Cedarbaum, filed by Plaintiff Roy Den Hollander on or about October 7, 2007. I attended the October 3, 2007 Initial Pretrial Conference (the "Conference") that Plaintiff unsuccessfully submits provides a basis for his motion to disqualify Judge Cedarbaum.

2. In my twenty-four years as a practicing attorney, who appears primarily in federal court, Plaintiff's contention that he "had no notice that the subject matter of the [Conference] was

going to focus on" the Motion To Dismiss filed by Defendant AER (Plaintiff ¶ 4),¹ is at best disingenuous. At such initial conferences, many judges discuss the merits of a case and ask the parties to justify the positions they are taking. An attorney appearing at such conferences is expected to be able to answer substantive questions about the case. There certainly is no authority to support the novel suggestion made by Plaintiff that such a conference is limited to discussion only of case management and scheduling orders. Plaintiff ¶ 5.

3. Judge Cedarbaum, consistent with this practice, merely pointed out that there was a jurisdictional question as to whether Title 42, United States Code, Section 1983 authorizes Plaintiff to file this lawsuit, alleging that private nightclubs which hold "Ladies' Nights as a promotion to encourage higher attendance, constitutes gender discrimination. In general, plaintiffs may not challenge private action by means of Section 1983. There must be state action, which on the face of the Complaint, appears to be absent in this case. Judge Cedarbaum simply asked questions of Plaintiff concerning jurisdiction.

4. There is absolutely nothing but conjecture to support Plaintiff's suggestion that the change to an earlier conference date was a conspiracy on the part of the Court to catch him unprepared to address the merits of his case or respond to AER's jurisdictional motion. Plaintiff ¶¶ 4-8. In any event, Plaintiff was not unprepared; he argued his position at length and Judge Cedarbaum permitted him to speak for a substantial period of time.

5. Plaintiff's assertion that the Court somehow improperly "reduce[d] a class action on behalf of thousands of men to a *pro se* case brought by a lone, individual man" is entirely unwarranted. Plaintiff ¶ 14. As a matter of law, Plaintiff is representing himself in this case; thus he is *pro se*. Further, no class has been certified. Thus, this is not yet a class action. The Court's comments on the status of the case accurately reflect its current procedural posture.

¹ "Plaintiff ¶ ____" refers to the Affirmation of Roy Den Hollander, dated October 7, 2007 and submitted in support of his motion to disqualify Judge Cedarbaum.

They do not reflect Judge Cedarbaum's views on the merits of the case, despite Plaintiff's baseless assumption that these comments somehow demean the lawsuit. Plaintiff ¶¶ 9,14.

6. Judge Cedarbaum's denial of Plaintiff's application to serve as interim class counsel was simply a judicial ruling. Plaintiff futilely tries to convert this judicial ruling into a sinister effort to rob Plaintiff of his opportunity to present oral argument in opposition to the defense motions to dismiss. Plaintiff ¶¶ 9-11. This convoluted argument rests on the Judge's individual rules, which do not provide for oral argument of motions in *pro se* cases. But the Court did not definitively state she would not hold oral argument in this case, where Plaintiff is *pro se* but also is a lawyer admitted to practice in this State. Before appointing class counsel, interim or otherwise, the question of jurisdiction must be resolved to determine whether the case will continue or be dismissed. There is nothing but Plaintiff's imagination to support the assertion that she had ulterior motives in denying his application to serve as interim class counsel.

7. During the conference, The Court set a return date of November 29, 2007 for all the jurisdictional defense motions. According to Judge Cedarbaum's individual practice rules for motions, therefore, the motions must be filed by November 7, 2007. Plaintiff then will have an opportunity to oppose all defense motions at once, by November 21, 2007, rather than submitting one opposition to the motion already filed by AER (the opposition deadline for that motion would have been October 16, 2007) and then file additional piecemeal oppositions to the other defense motions expected to be filed. Judge Cedarbaum did not "short circuit" Plaintiff's time to oppose AER's motion, despite Plaintiff's assertion otherwise. Plaintiff ¶ 7. Instead, she actually provided him with more time to submit written papers than he otherwise would have had.

8. The oral exchange between Judge Cedarbaum and Plaintiff on a fundamental question of law, namely the Court's jurisdiction, absolutely did not exhibit any animus,

antagonism or disdain on the Judge's part toward men. Plaintiff ¶¶ 5, 13, 14. Rather, the exchange reflected the Court's concern that it might lack jurisdiction, and she questioned Plaintiff extensively concerning this potential issue. When Plaintiff identified two lower court decisions in support of his position, Judge Cedarbaum invited him to send her those cases, thereby demonstrating her receptiveness to legal authority that supported Plaintiff's premise that the extensive regulation by the State is sufficient to constitute the necessary state action to confer Section 1983 jurisdiction.

9. Plaintiff's characterization of the Judge as "repeatedly interrupt[ing] him and cut[ting him] off" is inaccurate. Plaintiff ¶ 12. Rather, it was my observation that Plaintiff repeatedly interrupted Judge Cedarbaum, raising his voice in an effort to keep the Judge from finishing her remarks.

10. Plaintiff's accusation that Judge Cedarbaum "was motivated by sexual bias, sexual prejudice, and partiality toward the class of men on whose behalf the male named plaintiff brought this suit" is fantasy. Nothing was said by the Court that possibly could be construed as reflecting discriminatory animus against men. The conference focused solely on the jurisdictional question, not the substance of whether "Ladies Nights" discriminate against men. The accusation that the Judge is sexually biased or prejudiced against men is merely self-serving speculation.

11. This speculation stands in stark contrast to Plaintiff's unrelenting bias against females. Perhaps Plaintiff would prefer a male judge, given his negative stereotypes of women on the Internet, frequently referring to them as "feminazi." The attached Exhibit A includes examples of Plaintiff's invective against women. It is my understanding these "articles" appeared on the Internet. I personally have read diatribes by Plaintiff on the Internet which are entirely consistent with many of the views expressed in this exhibit. Unfortunately, I did not save them because Plaintiff's opinion of women is not at issue in the lawsuit he has brought. Had I

known he would level a baseless charge of gender discrimination against Judge Cedarbaum personally, I certainly would have retained them as they unequivocally reflect his misogyny. The articles suggest Plaintiff is challenging Judge Cedarbaum's impartiality simply because she is female, not biased. Plaintiff is the one who is sexually biased, not Judge Cedarbaum.

Dated: New York, New York
October 23, 2007


Deborah Swindells Donovan (DD 3421)

EXHIBIT "A"

Saturday, September 02, 2006 11:56 AM

Fear Corrupts

© Roy Den Hollander 2006

The purpose of the Feminist Movement is not equality, justice or freedom, but power—power over men. Virtually every female lives with a never-ending fear that just about any man has the physical power to do with her as he wishes. He can beat her up, rape or kill her with his bare hands, providing no one else is present to prevent it. She does, however, have recourse to the courts, and if she is dead, the prosecutor will try to avenge her, but when a female faces a man in a situation of imminent physical violence, she's powerless.

This lack of power to protect their own beings has driven many females to an uncontrollable fury and madness that has spawned a slithering, insidious, malicious obsession to control men totally by gutting their freedom of thought and speech and relegating them to the non-human status of beasts.

Feminists, or more appropriately Feminazis, use well-proven totalitarian tricks to reach this end. They propagandize their goal as liberation of all females, but in reality they aim to warp society's institutions into a big sister that relentlessly attacks, humiliates and demoralizes men.

The Feminazis profess their aim is to raise the consciousness of men and females, but they are actually carrying out a campaign of indoctrination and social pressure by assuming the role of scolding mothers or shrews. Their true goal is to domesticate men into sheepish little boys who will blindly obey their self-righteous, hypocritical and bigoted whims.

Having tasted social power, the Feminazis will not stop until they reshape America and eventually the world into an intolerant hell complete with thought-control, inquisitions, intimidation, enslavement and, as one Feminazi priestess advocated, a reduction in the male population to 10%. Perhaps the reduced male population will be kept in protective hamlets surrounded by armed guards and barbed wire where females can safely pick out their pleasure for the night and where females' fears remain entombed.

posted by admin with 0 Comments

Saturday, August 12, 2006 12:43 PM

Two Sides

© Roy Den Hollander, 2006

When I worked for Metromedia TV News, now Fox News, there was only one way out of the newsroom and above that door was a sign: "Each story has two sides—make sure you get both." That maxim is no longer followed by the effete, eastern intellectual, white trash, elitist media.

Today, the fifth estate kowtows to the current, political-correctionalist propaganda of depicting females as victims and men as oppressors. The news media and Hollywood portray the role of wife as dreadful and that of the husband as enviable. As with other superficially, politically naive analyses, the Feminazi infested media often fails to look beyond its members own biased beliefs to the reality of being a husband in feminarchy America

Everyday the husband leaves the house and children to trade 8, 10 or 12 hours of his life for the means to provide for his wife and offspring. Beyond food and housing, he must satiate her voracious appetite for material goods in her Sisyphean effort to keep up with Mrs. Jones; assuage her relentless vanity with expensive jewelry, perfumes, clothes and cosmetics; appease with social status her vindictive, vitriolic ranting as age lines her face; satisfy junior's whining for a new toy, bicycle or car; and fulfill his daughter's limitless greed for MTV hyped products.

At work, the husband must win out over others or jeopardize the means of satisfying his insatiable dependents. Job stress is an ever-present companion that contributes to the seven years shorter life span men have as compared to dames. Many husbands, however, do not have to worry about stress, because

their assigned role as serfs to princesses lands them in jobs that kill before stress has a chance to even raise their blood pressure. In the ten most hazardous jobs in America, over 90 percent of the workers are men. Every year industrial accidents kill twelve times more men than girls.

When an unfriendly nation decides to invade a husband's homeland, he, not his wife, will be drafted. The husband will go fight in order to protect his family and their way of life. In the twentieth century, 99 percent of the soldiers killed in wars were men. Perhaps death is the easy way for men to survive a war. Of the over two million young American men who served in Vietnam, approximately 800,000 suffer from post-traumatic stress syndrome. I wonder if any of these guys would have traded washing dishes for the hell they went through and are still suffering from.

In an emergency situation, females, including wives, and children are rescued first while men, including husbands, wait, hoping the grim reaper's scythe swings slowly enough for them to escape.

When the bottom of the economy falls out, the main provider of a family, usually the husband loses his job, which requires the family to seek government assistance. Some welfare programs require the husband to leave his home before the wife and children can receive support. As a result, the wife still has her children and a roof over her head while the husband walks the indifferent streets alone. Approximately 90 percent of America's three million homeless are men—not a few because of lost jobs stolen by broads.

At the other end of the economic scale where both husband and wife have well paying jobs, government and private support groups' discrimination against men has virtually no effect. But a form of male discrimination still exists. When the wife has a child, she often has the option to leave work to raise the child, to work part-time or return to work full-time. The husband also has three options: to continue working, to continue working and to continue working.

Finally, the burdens foisted on husbands and all men by this wo - man's nation cause men to commit suicide five times more often than females. For example, the Vietnam War killed around 58,000 young men; since that war's end, over 58,000 men who served in Vietnam have committed suicide.

When the Feminazis ask, "My God, who would want to be a wife?" Given the alternative—many.

posted by [admin](#) with [1 Comments](#)
[Saturday, August 12, 2006 12:25 PM](#)

An Invisible Weapon

© Roy Den Hollander, 2006

Physical violence mainly injures the body while emotional distress scars the mind. Contemporary feminazi groups and the political-correctionalist media and politicians incessantly depict husbands and boyfriends as brutal batterers of their innocent, defenseless wives and concubines. Trendy beliefs claim that a large percentage of America's 50% divorce rate results from the genetically programmed physical violence of men against females. The media, populace and politicians, however, ignore the incapacitating genetically programmed violence of emotional distress that wives and girls batter their beaus with day after day, year after year, which ends in a divorce, early grave for the husband or lawsuit against the man. Females intentionally or recklessly inflict emotional pain on a man with words, intonation of voice, facial demeanor and acts or patterns of behavior, often over a long period of time. For example, every time a guy leaves the refrigerator door open for more than some arbitrarily time limit set by his girl, the domineering paragon of everything correct barks "shut the door!" Over time, opening the refrigerator can become an unpleasant task—not unlike touching a live wire. Or the reckless, maybe intentional keeping of letters from the wife's lover in a place for the husband to find them in order to shatter the world of a faithful husband, especially if her sexual escapades occurred in the year prior to the birth of a child. As

the genetically evil female well knows, a nauseating doubt will plague the husband until the day he dies that his child may not be his. What redress for the pain she caused would the husband have in feminism America? none! In Russia, he could find some justice by slapping her around a bit, and if she called the cops, they'd help him out.

Girls have the advantage in America because physical violence is easy to prove: it leaves physical marks that a camera can record. Emotional violence, however, stalks the invisible world of the mind, which makes it a near perfect weapon. Husbands and boyfriends can't take pictures of the pain broads intentionally and recklessly cause them. Big Sister America is using that fact to tie men's hands, so they can no longer defend themselves against their girlfriends or wives twisting the blade of emotional pain through their hearts.

When will we see advertisements paid for by taxpayer dollars giving men a number to call to get some ragging, nagging, malicious broad to shut her yap? Not until science invents a technique for measuring emotional distress. Until then, a man has no choice but to follow Mother Nature, regardless of the cost, and slap the broad across the chops to stop the barrage of emotional bullets spewing from her tongue, which, of course, has always been a girl's gun.

posted by [admin](#) with 0 Comments
Wednesday, July 05, 2006 4:43 PM

A Different Time

A propeller driven plane drones somewhere overhead far out of sight. Its low monotone humming envelops a warm, spring Sunday afternoon somewhere in the 1950s. I sit on my 24 inch, black, single-gear Schwinn bicycle, keeping my balance by holding onto the door handle of an old, blue, four-door 1947 Dodge.

My consciousness pauses at the moment, feeling vaguely sad for no discernible reason. The week's events ended with this gift of nothing to do: no homework, no television shows, no new housing developments to explore or classmates able to come out and play.

The dead-end street needs a new asphalt topping. Where I am balance on the side, the asphalt has broken up into small gravel-like stones with an isolated weed sprouting up here and there. It is still early spring, the lawns are just beginning to turn green and the tulips and dogwood buds remain closed, waiting for a few consecutive days of warm weather. The air smells fresh, warmed slightly by a gentle breeze.

The droning airplane fills the vacuum of silence on this street with modest middle-class houses in this small suburban town, whose claim to fame will not come until the end of the next decade. Of all the towns in America, this town will have the second highest number of persons per capita to die in Vietnam—all of them men, of course, and all of them guys I knew.

posted by [admin](#) with 0 Comments
Friday, May 12, 2006 3:21 PM

Do Men Cause the Wars?

By Roy Den Hollander

During a trip to the evil empire—formerly the Soviet Union but still as evil as ever—a budding middle-aged Feminazi translator sternly ended her exposition about a battle depicted in a World War II museum outside Moscow with “Men cause the wars!” The American academicians and others along on the tour, including the males who were no longer men, nodded approvingly. Not me, my juvenile delinquent attitude, which I’ve never been able or wanted to outgrow, made me speak up: “Tell that to the guys pushing up daisies in the Falklands!” That shut the broad’s duplicitous mouth.

The Falklands, however, was just one war in which a female, Margaret Thatcher, helped kill 252 British and 655 Argentine soldiers, sailors, and airmen while doing in only three British females. What about all the other wars? Men certainly die in them in greater numbers than girls: the first Iraq war totaled about 22,000 men on both sides to 11 American female combat deaths and in Vietnam 58,185 American men to 8—that’s right—8 American females. But are guys the sole cause of that which destroys so many more men than broads? The National Organization of Witches (N.O.W.) and other

modern-day matriarchic tyrants would have us believe so because it infers that if men cause the wars, than they get what they deserve in war.

Let's look at the first Iraq war and April Glassby, the American ambassador to Iraq in 1990. She met Saddam Hussein just before he invaded Kuwait. At that time, there was rising tension between Iraq and Kuwait, Iraq was mobilizing and there were reports that Saddam might move across the border. So what did April tell Saddam at their meeting: the United States had no obligation to defend Kuwait. How dumb can you get! For dames it has no limits, especially in situations suited for men. Maybe April didn't want to offend Saddam's sensitivities by popping his illusion as the modern day Saladin. Whatever the reason for her stupidity, after April tells Saddam "green light," he naturally invades "as would any guy when a girl gives him the go-ahead" even though April probably meant "red light." What was Saddam suppose to do "read the bimbo's mind"? So he invades, figuring the U.S. won't intervene because that's what its ambassador said, and if the U.S. won't than no one will.

As for Viet Nam, lots of contributing factors went into bringing us that war, including the 1.8 million more votes Lyndon Johnson received from females than men in 1964. Of course, those bimbos didn't swing the election and Barry Goldwater might have dragged us into the same quagmire, but just looking at history as it played-out shows that more girls than guys were responsible for re-electing LBJ who turned Viet Nam into a male meat grinder.

How about the big killer of men "World War II"? The war that prompted the bimbo Russian translator to blame only men. This requires a little history "something the Feminazis are excellent at ignoring or re-writing.

The treaty ending the First World War set up the League of Nations. In order for the League, like the United Nations today, to have any power required America as a member. The League ended up including most of Europe, including Germany, as well as Japan and China "but no U.S. Here's why: President Woodrow Wilson and the leader of the Senate, Henry Cabot Lodge, had some disagreements over the League. Since the Senate would have to approve the treaty that called for U.S. membership, a compromise was crucial and likely because both men were politicians. But when Wilson suffered a stroke, his wife, in effect, took over as President "that doomed any chance of an agreement. When was the last time you tried to reach a compromise with a female? It's not possible! To broods "compromise" means only one thing: Do it their way! Without the U.S., the League ultimately proved incapable of preventing aggression by the Axis Powers in the 1930s, which culminated in World War II.

Another Mistress of War includes Queen Victoria with her campaigns of imperialism in Africa: the Anglo-Zulu War and the two Boer Wars. The Queen used 250,000 troops to conduct a scorched earth policy against the Boers and throw Africans and Boers into concentration camps: 27,927 Boers (of whom 22,074 were children under 16) and about 20,000 Africans died of starvation, disease and exposure. In all, about 25% of the Boer inmates and 17% of the African ones died. Concentration camps weren't new in 1900, but under the British matriarch Victoria, they wreaked an unprecedented toll of human misery. The Second Boer War alone cost around 75,000 lives " 22,000 British soldiers, 6,000-7,000 Boer soldiers, 20,000-28,000 Boer civilians and perhaps 25,000 Africans. The population of the world back then was 26% of what it is now, so multiply these figures by four to understand the scope of feminine barbarity.

Then there's one of the all time Hoing champs: Catherine the Great of Russia. Ho Catherine started or instigated a number of wars in order to expand her domain to the South and East into the Ottoman Empire and bite off pieces of Poland in the West. Her eminence killed plenty men in order to add some 200,000 square miles to Russian territory, and when finished, she had bankrupted the county. The current German chancellor Angela Merkel has a picture of Catherine the Great in her office because, as Angela says, "Catherine was a strong woman," which in Feminaziese means an unabashed Ho and destroyer of men.

There are plenty of other female tyrants throughout history who have unleashed the irrational fury of their twisted emotions when slighted, given vent to their insatiable greed and blown mindlessly passed

the chance of a compromise to kill plenty of men and others. The Feminazis conveniently ignored history hoping us guys will do the same and buy into their con of the empathetic female leader. Donâ€™t be fooled; broads are only empathetic so long as theyâ€™re looking in the mirror. The fighting and dying in wars will always fall on the shoulders of men, so it seems wise that to avoid unnecessary wars, men should keep bimbos out of the political decision making process.

posted by [admin](#) with [2 Comments](#)

[Friday, March 24, 2006 11:54 PM](#)

[Some Differences: Men v. Girls](#)

Â© Roy Den Hollander, 2006

Feminazi propaganda claims that except for a few mounds of flesh and "gender" organs, there's basically no difference between men and girls. They say broads can do virtually anything men canâ€™perhaps, but can they do the tasks evolutionarily suited for men as well as men? Not in the real world they can't.

Would you waste time and money watching a bunch of broads trying to play basketball when you can catch a higher quality of ball played by men in college or the NBA? I don't think so. Of course, if the girls play in their tongs and halter tops, that's different. If you need someone to do your taxes, you'd be a fool to use a bimbo. Studies at Vanderbilt University show that thirteen times more boys than girls score above 700 on the math part of the SAT. Why risk going to jail because some feminazi ditz can't add? Or what about investing the money for which you had to put up with so much grief to earn in an economy where over 50% of the jobs are held by dames? Are you going to hand it over to some vain Feminazi such as the former CEO of Hewlett Packard who spent lots of company resources and time aggrandizing herself while the stock dropped 55%? On the other hand, when it comes to prostitution ringsâ€™invest with the sluts. Los Angeles recently busted the largest call girl operation in its history that had raked in five to eight million in just 22 months. It was run by broads: a 42 year-old Russian whore and her 22 year-old harlot daughter who is still on the lam. Money for sex-any broads natural calling.

But when it comes to the work Mother Nature made men for, girls don't cut it. So the next time some Feminazi gives you that stern, serious lookâ€™like the one your mother did when trying to tell you something that made no senseâ€™and says, "I'm a strong and independent woman," meaning she's as good and tough as a guy, ask her to step outside. "Excuse me!" She'll indignantly respond in a tone meant to intimidate. Reply with "I'm challenging you to a duel. Let's see how strong, independent and tough you really are. You can even choose the weapons, so long as they're not T and As or duplicity." That'll shut her yap.

Feminazi proselytizing even demands us to believe that girls are better suited for certain male activities-only the high paying and powerful ones of course-because broads are more compassionate and caring. Nobody wants a compassionate general, but let's see whether bimbos really are "compassionate." Take a husband and wife who both work. While driving, the wife slams into another car-not surprising since she's running her mouth on a cell phone and between breaths and gibberish, she's sucking down a coffee latte. She ends up in the hospital-good-for weeks. The family income is cut, but the husband's main concern is that she's okay and gets well. He knows they'll make it through the financial crunch. Reverse the situation. The husband is broadsided by some bimbo yakking on her cell phone and sipping a coffee latte. The accident, more like recklessness, sends him to the hospital for weeks. The wife's only concern is the impact on her of the loss of income and sex. Sex, unless she's an adulteress, which most wives are until men no longer find them attractive. While this example shows females as being less compassionate than men, it does show them as equals in one sense: both are primarily concerned about the wife.

Although girls are not as competent as men at many tasks; they aren't powerless. Mother Nature gave them the ability to use sex, sexual favors and sympathy to win what they want. But feminarchy America now allows them to habitually get away with conduct they never could have before. Feminazis believe the universe exempted them from civilized conduct by making them female even though that was just an accident.

Some examples: Has a girl ever summarily pushed you out of the way in a crowded night club or in a stampede to squeeze her fat ass into a bus or subway spot that could fit only one of her cheeks? What